

REMARKS

Claims 1-39 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Applicant's representative notes with appreciation the withdrawal of the drawing objection under 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(4).

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 8-14, 16, 17, 20-22, 24, 26-28 Under 35 U.S.C.

§102(a)

Claims 1-4, 8-14, 16, 17, 20-22, 24, 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Schaeck *et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0163513). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Schaeck *et al.* does not disclose each and every limitation set forth in the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim*. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The *identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim*. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

Applicant's claimed subject matter, as recited in claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 12, 21 26, 33 and 34) relates to a system and method that employs one or more shared access profiles to interact with at least one networked device. The shared access profiles are *customized to delineate at least one of access and administrative privileges to the at least one networked device*. A user interface employs the shared access profile to provide *users having similar roles* with selective access to the at least one networked device. In other words, a single shared access profile is used

by multiple users, where the users' roles can be, *e.g.* an electrician or technician or others that require similar network access and privileges. It is maintained that Schaeck *et al.* does not disclose or suggest these novel features.

Schaeck *et al.* relates to a system and method of providing a business web portal that supports aggregate web services. The Advisory Action dated November 28, 2006 continues to contend that "shared access profiles" are disclosed in paragraphs [0022] and [0067] of this reference. The Examiner repeats the statement from previous Office Actions that "Paragraph [0067] teaches that different roles for a user can exist in one profile in that the user can login as either employee or admin." Other arguments are offered that explain how this is disclosed in the cited document. However, it is once again respectfully submitted that these contentions simply do not address the issue of the claimed invention as recited in the subject claims. Paragraph [0067] clearly discloses:

[0067] Preferred embodiments of the present invention build on this concept, and extend the role-based processing in order to provide multiple views into a business web, according to the present invention. In preferred embodiments, *the specification of the role that corresponds to the user's current log-on status is stored as an attribute of the user's profile*. For example, when a systems administrator logs on with his/her administrative identifier and password, these values will preferably identify a user profile where the user's role is "admin" (or some semantic equivalent). *If this same person logs on with another identifier, such as a regular employee identifier, then that identifier and password preferably identify a different user profile record having a different user role.* The user's profile is preferably accessed using the provisioning interface. (In alternative embodiments, the role information may be stored elsewhere, and/or may be accessed using methods provided in an interface other than the provisioning interface, including a dedicated "Roles" interface.)

Paragraph [0022] states:

[0022] Preferably, the user role is stored in a user profile associated with the user, and the user role is determined using the user's identification and credentials.

It is therefore abundantly clear that Schaeck *et al.* employs multiple roles for a single user. This point is correctly noted in the Advisory Action, the fact of which is not in any way disputed by Applicant. However, it must be appreciated that these disclosures from Schaeck *et al.* are completely irrelevant to the claimed invention which relates to *a shared access profile for users having similar roles*, which can be construed as a single role for multiple users. It must therefore be understood that Schaeck *et al.* is in contradistinction to the claimed invention. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the contentions in the Advisory Action and throughout prosecution have been misguided and do not pertain the claimed invention.

The Advisory Action maintains that paragraphs [0022] and particularly [0067] of Schaeck *et al.* disclose the claimed *shared access profile* that includes *customized access and/or administrative privileges to a networked device*, further stating that “paragraph [0067] teaches customized access with the employee role, and it teaches administrative privileges with the administrative role.” However, as can be seen in paragraph [0067] quoted above, this passage clearly states that roles are specified that correspond to “the user's current log-on status” which “is stored as an attribute of the user's profile.” This paragraph further states that a single user must logon and logoff using a different ID and password in order access the different user profile records having different roles. In no way can these paragraphs or any other portions of Schaeck *et al.* be construed as *providing users having similar roles with selective access to the networked device*, as presently claimed. As with previous Office Actions, the Advisory Action states that this is disclosed in paragraph [0043], however this slim citation merely uses the term “users” in the plural, and does not disclose or suggest that these users are operating with a *shared access profile* as claimed.

In view of at least the foregoing arguments, it remains clear that there is nothing in Schaeck *et al.* that discloses or suggests a system or method in accordance with the claimed invention. Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 1, 12, 21, 26, 33 and 34 (and claims that depend there from) should be withdrawn.

The arguments made the previous Reply in connection with the dependent claims are not contended in the Advisory Action. Therefore, these arguments are maintained but not presently restated herein.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [ALBRP318US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731